



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,064	12/27/2001	James M. Foley	03292.101170	3303
66569 7590 02/28/2008 FITZPATRICK CELLA (AMEX) 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112				
EXAMINER PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J				
ART UNIT 2137		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 02/28/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/035,064

Applicant(s)

FOLEY ET AL.

Examiner

MICHAEL PYZOSHA

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 14-16 and 19-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 14-16 and 19-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-7, 14-16, and 19-22 are pending.
2. Amendment filed 12/27/2007 has been received and considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7, 14-16, and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahoo! (Archived Web pages from 08/16/2000) in view of Wood et al. (US 6892307).

As per claims 1, 5, 14-16, 19, and 21, Yahoo discloses enabling a user to select a method of authentication for access to the restricted service, wherein the restricted service requires a method of authentication in order to gain access to the restricted service (see page 1 choosing a username and password); registering the user-selected method of authentication which facilitates the user's ability for gaining

access to the restricted service (see page 1); presenting the registered method of authentication as the method of authentication for access to the restricted service (see pages 1 and 3 the logging into the Yahoo account); wherein the user is enabled to select a different method of authentication for access to the restricted service without accessing the restricted service (see pages 2 and 4 where the user can log in as normal, or go through the forgotten password to obtain a new password to log in or the user can sign in using a different username and password); wherein the registered method of authentication is presented as the method of authentication for subsequent attempts to gain access to the restricted service without requiring subsequent re-registration of the registered method, until such time as the user selects such different method of authentication (see page 3).

Yahoo fails to explicitly disclose enabling a user to select a method of authentication from a plurality of methods of authentication for access to the restricted service.

However, Wood et al. teaches enabling a user to select a method of authentication from a plurality of methods for access to a restricted service (see column 11 lines 30-51).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to allow a user of Yahoo

to select one of a plurality of authentication methods for access to the restricted service.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow the user to select the suitable authentication scheme (see Wood et al. column 11 lines 30-38).

As per claims 2, 6, 20, and 22, the modified Yahoo and Wood et al. system discloses the method of authentication includes at least one of user identification and password; user identification and pass-phrase; smart card and PIN; smart card and digital certificate; biometrics; sound verification; radio frequency and password; infrared and password; and handheld computing device and digital certificate (see Yahoo pages 1-4 and Wood et al. column 11 lines 30-51).

As per claims 3 and 7, the modified Yahoo and Hillhouse system discloses enabling the user to select more than one method of authentication for access to the restricted service (see Yahoo page 4 and Hillhouse column 7 lines 2-6).

As per claim 4, the modified Yahoo and Hillhouse system discloses the step of registering the user-selected method of authentication as a minimum level of security for authentication for the user (see Yahoo page 1).

The selected method of authentication is a minimum level of security for authentication because at least the selected method must be performed.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 14-16 and 19-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kao teaches a system with multiple authentication methods available to the user.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PYZOCHA whose telephone number is (571)272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm first Fridays of the bi-week off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the

Art Unit: 2137

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MJP

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2137